



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,903	03/16/2004	James Scott Rhodes JR.	PCCR122524	3403
26389	7590	08/25/2009		
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC			EXAMINER	
1420 FIFTH AVENUE			JANAKIRAMAN, NITHYA	
SUITE 2800				
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			ART UNIT	
			PAPER NUMBER	
			2123	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			08/25/2009	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/801,903

Applicant(s)

RHODES ET AL.

Examiner

NITHYA JANAKIRAMAN

Art Unit

2123

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NITHYA JANAKIRAMAN.

(3) _____.

(2) Clint Feekes (Reg. 51,670).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Koenig, Hall, Bowman.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed at length the history of the claimed subject matter. Applicant attempted to explain the differences between the claim subject matter and the prior art, specifically a separation of processing and data, and the component based approach. Applicant did not inform the Examiner as to whether a response would now be filed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Nithya Janakiraman/
Examiner, Art Unit 2123